

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Editorially amend the specification.
2. Editorially amend claims 1 – 6 for mooted, e.g., the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.
3. Add new claims 7 - 22.
4. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.
5. Advise the Examiner of the simultaneous filing of an IDS with a GB Examination Report and reference cited therein.

B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus (see enumerated paragraphs 10-17 of the Office Action). claims 3, 5 and 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus in view of U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al (see enumerated paragraphs 20-22 of the Office Action). All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for reasons including but not limited to those which follow.

U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus does not recognize the existence of different versions of the H.323 standard, nor does it in any way address the consequences and ramifications of moving from H.323 V1 standard to the H.323 V2 standard. Nor does U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus address implementation of the H.235 for authentication of end-points operating with a network on end-points of "older" types that still operate according to the H323 V1 standard without H.235 support.

Not only does U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus not address the problems solved by Applicant, but Naudus also may be understood to teach away from the claimed subject matter by employment of a separate authentication/authorization server 26 located in the network. Naudus' server 26 is not involved in any of the activities related to the exchange of H.323 RAS messages. Contrary to Applicants' technique, the Naudus authentication/authorization server 26 exclusively communicates with the end-point represented by the local gateway 40. By contrast, Applicants' authentication proxy communicates with both the end-points and the gatekeeper, by using the appropriate H.323 version and/or H.235 towards the gatekeeper and a different protocol towards the n-point.

Naudus discloses H.323 RAS message exchange between the end-point (represented by the local gateway 40) and the gatekeeper 42, without expressing any concerns whatsoever with regard to an authentication problem that will be encountered in a network where the end-points and the gatekeeper operate with the different versions of the H.323 standard. However, such problem will not be deemed relevant to Naudus, Naudus employs a totally separate authentication/authorization server, and thereby provide an altogether different scheme for authentication, i.e., a scheme has no substantial similarities with the claimed subject matter.

U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al comprises more than 300 pages of drawings and written disclosure. In a searchable format, U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al has 83 different occurrences of the terms "authenticate" and "authentication", and variants thereof. Through the applicant's analysis of these 83 occurrences of terms related to authentication, the applicant has not been able to identify a disclosure that may be considered relevant in respect to the claimed subject matter.

In the above regard, U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al includes several references to the use of an authentication server (exemplified by a RADIUS or Keystone server), and other embedded authentication solutions being part of such network elements such as an Internet access device or a voice authentication server. Yet on the other hand, nowhere does the disclosure of the 525 patent refer to a solution that includes an authentication proxy that addresses the incompatibility problem encountered with different versions of the H.323 or authentication by way of H.235 as claimed. In fact, U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al does not provide any details at all with regard to possible means or methods that may be related to the authentication specifics in a H.323 network.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, the Examiner has ample bases for withdrawing all rejections and for allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, a formal indication of allowance is earnestly solicited.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

Any additional claims fees necessitated by this Amendment are indicated on the attached transmittal letter and are paid by an accompanying check. Alternatively, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100